

Exhibit GG

ZIMMERMAN REED, PLLP
CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ (AZ Bar No. 029602)
E-mail: Charles.Zimmerman@zimmreed.com
HART L. ROBINOVITCH, ESQ (AZ Bar No. 020910)
E-mail:Hart.Robinovitch@zimmreed.com
BRADLEY C. BUHROW, ESQ (CA Bar No. 283791)
(Admission *Pro Hac Vice* to be Filed)
E-mail: Brad.Buhrow@zimmreed.com
14646 N. Kierland Blvd., Suite 145
Scottsdale, AZ 85254
(480) 348-6400 Telephone
(480) 348-6415 Facsimile

Attorneys for the Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

KYLE PHILLIP, EVELYN TORRES, and
KELLY KIRKPATRICK, individually, and
on behalf of themselves and all others
similarly situated.

Case No.:

Plaintiffs,

V.

GENERAL MOTORS, LLC,

(Jury Trial Demanded)

Defendant.

Plaintiffs Kyle Phillip, Evelyn
hereinafter as “Plaintiffs” bring this
against Defendant General Motors, L
on behalf of themselves and all others
and belief and the investigation of
knowledge, hereby alleges as follows:

I. NATURE OF ACTION

1. This class action lawsuit is brought by the above-named Plaintiffs on behalf of themselves and all other similarly situated persons in the Class and State Subclasses defined below against GM. The case stems from GM's failure to disclose material defects in certain GM vehicles; instead opting to affirmatively conceal the known material defects.

1 2. Through this class action Plaintiffs, on behalf of the Class, challenge the
2 unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices of Defendant in connection with its
3 designing, manufacturing, assembling, promoting, marketing, supplying, selling, and
4 otherwise placing into the stream of commerce millions of vehicles throughout the United
5 States and worldwide that have a safety defect in which the vehicles ignition switch can
6 unintentionally move from the “run” position to the “accessory” or “off” position, resulting
7 in loss of power, vehicle speed control, and braking, as well as a failure of the vehicles’
8 airbags to deploy.

9 3. Plaintiffs brings this action on behalf of a Class of all persons in the United
10 States who currently own or lease one or more of the following GM vehicles: 2003-2011
11 Saturn Ion; 2005-2011 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-2011 Pontiac G5; 2006-2011 Chevrolet
12 HHR; 2005-2011 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-2011 Pontiac Solstice; and 2007-2011 Saturn Sky
13 (hereinafter “Defective Vehicles”). These people are referred to herein as the “Class.”

14 4. Since at least 2002, GM has designed, manufactured, assembled, sold and
15 otherwise placed into the stream of commerce vehicles with common defects related to the
16 ignition switch, all of which create a substantial risk of injury or death when used as
17 designed and for their intended purpose. Each of the Defective Vehicles contains a
18 uniformly designed ignition switch, which is substantially similar for all of the Defective
19 Vehicles.

20 5. GM began installing these defective ignition switch systems in models from
21 2002 through at least 2007 and possibly later. Despite promising that these new ignition
22 switch systems would operate safely and reliably, the defective ignition switch systems
23 suffered from common quality and safety defects, which GM concealed and failed to fix for
24 years.

25 6. As early as 2004, GM began receiving reports of crashes and injuries related
26 to the ignition switch systems, which put GM on notice of the serious safety issues
27 presented by its ignition switch system.

1 7. Yet, despite GM's knowledge and despite the dangerous nature of the defects
2 and their effects on critical safety systems, GM concealed the existence of the defects and
3 failed to repair the problem.

4 8. Rather than eliminate the defects contained in its ignition switch systems – or
5 provide an adequate warning of the potential safety risks to drivers of its Defective Vehicles
6 – GM instead sought to conceal the dangers inherent in their Defective Vehicles.

7 9. During all relevant times, GM continued to advertise its Defective Vehicles as
8 being “safe” and “reliable” despite having knowledge that the Defective Vehicles were not
9 safe and reliable.

10 10. This case arises from GM's breach of its obligations and duties, including
11 GM's failure to disclose that, as a result of defective ignition switch design, at least 1.4
12 million GM vehicles had the propensity to shut down during normal driving conditions,
13 which creates an extreme and unreasonable risk of accident, serious bodily harm, and death

14 11. GM's predecessor, General Motors Corporation (“Old GM”) also violated
15 these duties by designing and marketing vehicles with defective ignition switches, failing to
16 disclose that defect after it became aware that the ignition switch defect was causing fatal
17 accidents. In addition to the liability arising out of the statutory obligations assumed by GM,
18 GM also has successor liability for the deceptive and unfair acts and omissions of Old GM
19 because GM has continued the business enterprise of Old GM with full knowledge of the
20 ignition switch defects.

21 12. The defective ignition switches were manufactured by Delphi Automotive
22 PLC (“Delphi”). Once a subsidiary of Old GM, Delphi spun-off from Old GM in 1999, and
23 was an independent publicly held corporation.

24 13. Upon information and belief, Delphi knew its ignition switches were
25 defective, but nevertheless continued to manufacture and sell the defective ignition switch
26 systems, which it knew would be used in the vehicles of Plaintiffs and the Class.

27 14. Plaintiffs bring this action for a Class of all persons in the United States who
28 currently own or lease one or more of the following GM vehicles: 2003-07 Saturn Ion;

1 2005-07 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-2007 Pontiac G5; 2006-07 Chevrolet HHR; 2005-006
2 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-07 Pontiac Solstice; and 2007 Saturn Sky (hereinafter “Defective
3 Vehicles”).

4 15. Plaintiffs also bring this action on behalf of subclasses of Arizona, New York
5 and Michigan residents who own or lease one or more of the Defective Vehicles.

6 16. Plaintiffs believe that there are other GM vehicles which suffer from the same
7 or substantially similar ignition switch defects as the Defective Vehicles identified above.
8 Accordingly, Plaintiffs will supplement the list of Defective Vehicles to include additional
9 GM vehicles that have defective ignition switches, which result in a loss of vehicle speed
10 control, loss of braking control, and airbag non-deployment.

11 17. The Defective Vehicles are defective and dangerous for multiple reasons,
12 including the following (collectively referred to herein as the “ignition switch defects”):

- 13 a. The ignition switches can inadvertently shut off the engine and
14 vehicle electrical system during normal driving conditions;
- 15 b. When the engine and the electrical system shut down, the power
16 steering and power brakes also shut down, creating a serious risk of
17 accident;
- 18 c. When the electrical system shuts down, the vehicle’s airbags are
19 disabled, creating a serious risk of serious bodily harm or death if an
20 accident occurs.

21 18. The ignition switch defects make the Defective Vehicles unreasonably
22 dangerous. The defective nature of the Defective Vehicles renders them likely to be
23 involved in accidents, and, if accidents occur, there is an unreasonable and extreme risk of
24 serious bodily harm or death to the vehicle’s occupants.

25 19. GM admits to at least twelve deaths as a result of the ignition switch defects,
26 but the actual number is believed to be much higher.

27 20. The ignition switch defects present a significant and unreasonable safety risk
28 exposing Defective Vehicle owners and their passengers to a risk of serious injury or death.

1 The safety risks presented are ongoing and continuing.

2 21. For many years, GM has known of the ignition switch defects that exist in
3 millions of Defective Vehicles sold in the United States. But, to protect its profits and
4 maximize sales, GM concealed the defects and their tragic consequences and allowed
5 unsuspecting vehicle owners to continue driving highly dangerous vehicles.

6 22. Under the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability and
7 Documentation Act (“TREAD Act”),¹ and its accompanying regulations, when a
8 manufacturer learns that a vehicle contains a safety defect, the manufacturer must promptly
9 disclose the defects.² If it is determined that the vehicle is defective, the manufacturer had
10 an affirmative duty to notify and warn vehicle owners, purchasers, and dealers of the defect
11 and must remedy the defect.³

12 23. This duty is continuing and arose when GM, including General Motors
13 Corporation, learned of the ignition switch defect. As such, this duty to disclose continued
14 through all times relevant to this Complaint. The duty to disclose survived and continued
15 through General Motors Corporation’s bankruptcy, and was assumed by GM the moment
16 GM was formed. GM had a continuing duty to notify and warn vehicle owners, purchasers,
17 lessees, and dealers of the defect and to take steps to remedy the defect in each Class
18 member’s vehicle each and every day since it was formed. As described within, GM failed
19 to do this and breached its duties.

20 24. In addition to the TREAD Act and other laws, GM violated, *inter alia*, the
21 Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, the Michigan Consumer Protection Act and New York’s
22 Consumer Protection from Deceptive Acts and Practices Statute and fraudulently concealed
23 the deadly ignition switch defects from consumers, owners, and lessees of the Defective
24 Vehicles. GM also violated the TREAD Act by failing to timely inform NHTSA of the
25 ignition switch defects and allowed cars to remain on the road with these defects.

26 25. GM’s actions, breaches of its duties, and concealment of material facts injure

27 ¹ 49 U.S.C. §§ 30101-30170.

28 ² 49 U.S.C. § 30118(c)(1) & (2)

³ 49 U.S.C. § 30118(b)(2)(A) & (B).

1 and harm consumers in the Class by inducing them to unknowingly purchase and/or retain a
2 vehicle that contains inherent dangers and defects. Given GM's superior knowledge of the
3 ignition switch defects and the inherent risk of the danger involved in their continued use,
4 GM had an ongoing duty to disclose such facts to members of the class. During relevant
5 time periods, GM's provided no notice of the inherent and potential risks of use of their
6 Defective Vehicles to consumers, but rather concealed those risks through omissions of
7 material fact and through affirmative representations in marketing, sales and operational
8 material that represent that the Defective Vehicles are safe and defect-free.

9 26. Reasonable consumers in the Class would have acted differently had they
10 been told of the material facts regarding the defects and safety risks presented. GM
11 concealed and suppressed material facts when they were duty bound to disclose such facts.
12 At the very least, had Old GM or GM disclosed the ignition switch defects and safety risks
13 presented sooner, as they were duty bound to do, Plaintiffs and members of the Class, like
14 any reasonable consumers, would not have purchased the vehicles they did; would have
15 paid less than they did; would not have retained the vehicles; and/or would have demanded
16 that GM correct the ignition switch defect sooner. GM's fraudulent concealment and
17 deceptive practices prevented this. As a result, any statutes of limitations should be tolled.

18 27. Plaintiffs and the Class have been further damaged by GM's
19 misrepresentations, concealment and non-disclosure of the ignition switch defects in the
20 Defective Vehicles, as they are now holding highly dangerous vehicles whose value has
21 greatly diminished because of GM's failure to timely disclose the serious defect.

22 28. Plaintiffs and the Class were also damaged by the acts and omissions of Old
23 GM for which GM is liable through successor liability because the Defective Vehicles they
24 purchased are worth less than they would have been without the ignition switch defects.

25 29. Plaintiffs and the Class paid more for the Defective Vehicles than they would
26 have had they known of the ignition defects or they would not have purchased the Defective
27 Vehicles at all.

28

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

30. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §1332(a) and (d) because the amount in controversy for the Class exceeds \$5,000,000.00, and Plaintiffs and other Class members are citizens of a different state than Defendant.

31. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Plaintiffs because Plaintiffs submits to the Court's jurisdiction. This Court has personal jurisdiction over GM because GM conducts substantial business in this District, and some of the actions giving rise to the complaint took place in this District.

32. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §1391 because a substantial part of the event or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred within this District, and because Plaintiff Kyle Phillip is a resident of Flagstaff, Arizona, which is in this District. Additionally, GM transacts business within the District, and some of the events establishing the claims arose in this District.

III. PARTIES

33. Plaintiff and Named Class Representative Kyle Phillip is a resident and citizen of Flagstaff, Arizona. Plaintiff owns a 2006 Saturn Ion. Plaintiff chose the Ion in part because he wanted a safely designed and manufactured vehicle.

34. Induced by GM's fraudulent concealment and misrepresentations about the existence of a defect of the severity and extent of defects, which left his without knowledge of the conditions or the lack of value in a vehicle containing such unremedied defects, Plaintiff purchased his Saturn Ion in 2012 from Dodge, Jeep and Chrysler in Flagstaff, Arizona. He paid between around \$5,300 for the Ion, not knowing that it was sold in the defective condition.

35. Plaintiff Phillip experienced problems with the ignition system in his Ion. Since owning the Ion it has shut down approximately five (5) times. As such, Plaintiff Phillip is concerned about the safety of his Ion. GM should have disclosed the ignition switch defect when Plaintiff Phillip purchased his Ion.

36. In addition to the Saturn Ion, Plaintiff Phillip owns a 2009 Chevrolet HHR.

1 37. Induced by GM's fraudulent concealment and misrepresentations about the
2 existence of a defect of the severity and extent of defects, which left his without knowledge
3 of the conditions or the lack of value in a vehicle containing such unremedied defects,
4 Plaintiff purchased his HHR in 2013 from Terry Marxen Chevrolet and Cadillac in
5 Flagstaff, Arizona. He paid between around \$22,000 for the HHR, not knowing that it was
6 sold in the defective condition.

7 38. Plaintiff Phillip did not learn of the ignition switch defects until about March
8 2014. Had Old GM or GM disclosed the ignition switch defects, Plaintiff Phillip, like any
9 reasonable consumer, would not have purchased the vehicles he did; would have paid less
10 than he did; would not have retained the vehicles; and/or would have demanded that GM
11 correct the ignition switch defects sooner. GM's fraudulent concealment and deceptive
12 practices prevented this.

13 39. Plaintiff and Named Class Representative Evelyn Torres is a resident and
14 citizen of New York, New York. Plaintiff owns a 2007 Chevrolet Cobalt. Plaintiff chose
15 the Cobalt in part because she wanted a safely designed and manufactured vehicle.

16 40. Induced by GM's fraudulent concealment and misrepresentations about the
17 existence of a defect of the severity and extent of defects, which left her without knowledge
18 of the conditions or the lack of value in a vehicle containing such unremedied defects,
19 Plaintiff retained possession of her Cobalt.

20 41. Plaintiff Torres did not learn of the ignition switch defects until about March
21 2014. Had Old GM or GM disclosed the ignition switch defects, Plaintiff Torres, like any
22 reasonable consumer, would not have purchased the Cobalt; would have paid less than she
23 did; would not have retained the vehicle; and/or would have demanded that GM correct the
24 ignition switch defect sooner. Defendant's fraudulent concealment and deceptive practices
25 prevented this.

26 42. Plaintiff and Named Class Representative Kelly Kirkpatrick is a resident and
27 citizen of Mancelona, Michigan. Plaintiff owns a 2007 Saturn Ion. Plaintiff chose the Ion in
28 part because she wanted a safely designed and manufactured vehicle.

1 43. Induced by GM's fraudulent concealment and misrepresentations about the
2 existence of a defect of the severity and extent of defects, which left her without knowledge
3 of the conditions or the lack of value in a vehicle containing such unremedied defects,
4 Plaintiff Kirkpatrick purchased her Saturn Ion in 2009 from Bill Marsh Auto in Michigan.
5 She paid between \$12,000 and \$13,000 for the Ion, not knowing that it was sold in the
6 defective condition.

7 44. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick did not learn of the ignition switch defects until about
8 March 2104. Had Old GM or GM disclosed the ignition switch defects, Plaintiff
9 Kirkpatrick, like any reasonable consumer, would not have purchased the Cobalt; would
10 have paid less than she did; would not have retained the vehicle; and/or would have
11 demanded that GM correct the ignition switch defect sooner. GM's fraudulent concealment
12 and deceptive practices prevented this.

13 45. Defendant General Motors LLC ("GM") is a foreign limited liability company
14 formed under the laws of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 300
15 Renaissance Center, Detroit, Michigan.

16 46. GM, which is the successor GM entity resulting from the GM Chapter 11
17 bankruptcy proceeding, contractually assumed liability for the claims in this lawsuit. The
18 Defective Vehicles were originally designed, manufactured, marketed, and distributed into
19 the stream of commerce by GM's predecessor, General Motors Corporation ("Old GM.").
20 GM incorporated in 2009 and on July 10, 2009 acquired substantially all assets and assumed
21 certain liabilities of Old GM through the Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceeding.

22 47. As demonstrated by the fact that GM has initiated and is conducting a recall of
23 the Defective Vehicles (although being incomplete), it is legally responsible for those
24 vehicles still on the road and recognizes that it is responsible for those vehicles despite old
25 GM's bankruptcy.

26 48. Among the liabilities and obligations expressly retained by GM after the
27 bankruptcy are the following:

1 From and after the Closing, Purchaser [GM] shall comply with the
2 certification, reporting and recall requirements of the National Traffic and
3 Motor Vehicle Act, the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability
4 and Documentation Act, the Clean Air Act, the California Health and
Safety Code, and similar laws, in each case, to the extent applicable in
respect of vehicles and vehicle parts manufactured or distributed by [Old
GM].

5 49. GM also expressly assumed:

6 all Liabilities arising under express written warranties of [Old GM] that are
7 specifically identified as warranties and delivered in connection with the
8 sale of new, certified used or pre-owned vehicles or new or remanufactured
9 motor vehicle parts and equipment (including service parts, accessories,
engines and transmissions) manufactured or sold by [Old GM] or Purchaser
prior to or after the Closing and (B) all obligations under Lemon Laws.

10 50. Because GM acquired and operated Old GM⁴ and ran it as a continuing
11 business enterprise, and because GM was aware from its inception of the ignition switch
12 defects in the Defective Vehicles, GM is liable through successor liability for the deceptive
13 and unfair acts and omissions of Old GM, as alleged in this Complaint.

14 51. Additionally, in current advertisements and promotional material, including
15 but not limited to GM's website,⁵ GM represents and holds itself out to the public as being
16 the same company as Old GM.

17 52. Specifically, GM represents on its website that GM "has played a pivotal role
18 in the global auto industry for more than 100 years. From the first Buick horseless carriages
19 to technological marvels like the Chevrolet Volt, our products and innovations have always
20 excelled at putting the world on wheels."

21 53. GM cannot absolve itself of liability due to any bankruptcy proceedings
22 involving Old GM, prior to the formation of GM. Material facts regarding the defects and

24 ⁴ Through the sale of Old GM to GM, specifically through the Amended and Restated
25 Master Sale and Purchase Agreement, GM purchased and is the owner of all "vehicles"
26 and "finished goods" (cars) of old GM, "wherever located," and including any vehicles or
finished goods in the "possession of" "customers." Further, GM is the owner of all Old
GM's documents and has knowledge thereof. Under this agreement, GM both "Purchased
Assets" and "Assumed Liabilities," which included "all Liabilities arising out of, relating
to, in respect of, or in connection with the use, ownership or sale of the Purchased
Assets" after the sale.

28 ⁵ <http://www.gm.com/company/historyAndHeritage.html> (last visited March 27, 2014).

1 potential liabilities were never disclosed in those proceedings but intentionally and
2 deceptively concealed and suppressed from the public, the courts and the Class.

3 IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

4 A. **The Defective Vehicles Share A Common Defect (“Ignition Switch Defect”), 5 Which GM Had Knowledge Of For At Least a Decade; Actively Concealing Such Knowledge And Defects The Entire Time.**

6 54. Beginning at least in 2002, and continuing until at least 2007, GM designed,
7 manufactured, assembled, marketed, sold and otherwise placed into the stream of commerce
8 vehicles containing defective ignition switch systems – the Defective Vehicles.

9 55. The defective ignition switch systems in the Defective Vehicles cause the
10 car’s engine and electrical system to shut off, disabling the power steering, power brakes,
11 and disabling numerous safety related features, including but not limited to, the non-
12 deployment of the vehicle’s airbags in the event of a crash.

13 56. Given the importance that a vehicle and its electrical operating systems
14 remain operational during ordinary driving conditions, it is imperative that a vehicle
15 manufacturer ensure that its vehicles remain operational from the time the driver starts the
16 vehicle until the driver intentionally shuts down the vehicle. With respect to the Defective
17 Vehicles, GM has failed to do so.

18 57. The Defective Vehicles, therefore, create serious safety risks, as they are
19 unreasonably prone to be involved in accidents, and those accidents are unreasonably likely
20 to result in serious bodily injury or death to the drivers and passengers of the Defective
21 Vehicles, as well as to other vehicle operators and pedestrians.

22 58. Under the Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability and
23 Documentation Act (“TREAD Act”),⁶ and accompanying regulations, GM and Old GM
24 both had a duty to promptly disclose the ignition switch defect to Class members when GM
25 and/or Old GM learned of the safety related defect and to fully repair the defect. This duty
26 to disclose arose upon learning of the defect and continued each and every day up until the
27 date of this filing.

28 ⁶ 49 U.S.C. §§ 30101-30170.

1 59. Alarmingly, however, both Old GM and GM had actual knowledge of the
2 deadly ignition switch defects and their dangerous consequences for many years.
3 Notwithstanding this knowledge, Old GM and GM failed to disclose the defect for many
4 years; concealing the true nature and extent of the defect. During relevant time periods, GM
5 and Old GM never attempted to eliminate the ignition switch defect, nor minimize the effect
6 of the ignition switch defects. Old GM and GM never stopped selling and placing the
7 dangerous Defective Vehicles into the stream of commerce. Old GM and GM never
8 provided adequate warnings of the risks of use of the Defective Vehicles. Rather, both Old
9 GM and GM actively concealed the dangers and risks inherent in their Defective Vehicles
10 from consumers, and federal regulators such as NHTSA.

11 60. For example, on July 29, 2005, Amber Marie Rose, age 16, died after her
12 2005 Chevrolet Cobalt crashed and the airbag failed to deploy. Ms. Rose's death was the
13 first of the hundreds deaths and injuries attributable to the ignition switch defects. Ms.
14 Rose's death was an early warning in what would become a decade-long failure by Old GM
15 and GM to address the ignition switch problem.

16 61. Another incident involved sixteen year-old Megan Phillips. Ms. Phillips was
17 driving a 2005 Chevrolet Cobalt that crashed in Wisconsin in 2006, killing two of her
18 teenage friends when the car left the road and hit a clump of trees. NHTSA investigators
19 found that the key had moved from the "run" to the "accessory" position, turning off the
20 engine and disabling the vehicle's airbags before impact. According to Ms. Phillips, the
21 families of her deceased friends blamed her and refused to speak with her; only after the
22 recall was finally announced did they begin communicating. As she stated, "I don't
23 understand why [GM] would wait 10 years to say something. And I want to understand it
24 but I never will."⁷

25 62. Rather than publicly admitting the dangerous safety defects in its vehicles,
26 GM attempted to attribute these and other incidents to "driver error." Every year from 2005
27 to 2012, first Old GM and then GM received reports of deaths in Cobalts involving steering
28

⁷ "Owners of Recalled GM Cars Feel Angry, Vindicated," Reuters (Mar. 17, 2014).

1 and/or airbag failures, including:

- 2 • 2005: 26 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 1 death citing
3 Airbag as component involved.
- 4 • 2006: 69 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 2 deaths citing
5 Airbag as component involved and 4 deaths citing Unknown
component.
- 6 • 2007: 87 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 3 deaths citing
7 Airbag as component involved.
- 8 • 2008: 106 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 1 death citing
9 Airbag as component involved and 2 deaths citing Unknown
component.
- 10 • 2009: 133 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 1 death citing
11 Airbag as component involved, 1 death citing Service Brake as
component involved, 1 death citing Steering as component involved,
and 2 deaths citing Unknown component.
- 12 • 2010: 400 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 2 deaths citing
13 Airbag as component involved, 12 deaths citing steering as component
involved, and 1 death citing Unknown component.
- 14 • 2011: 187 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 2 deaths citing
15 Airbag as component involved, 2 deaths citing Steering as component
involved, and 1 Unknown component.
- 16 • 2012: 157 Cobalt Death and Injury Incidents, including 5 deaths citing
17 Airbag as component involved, and 4 deaths citing Steering as
component involved.

18 63. GM now admits that Old GM learned of the ignition switch defects as early as
19 2001. During developmental testing of the Saturn Ion, Old GM engineers learned that the
20 ignition could inadvertently move from the “Run” position to the “Accessory” or “Off”
21 position.⁸

22 64. Specifically, a pre-production report for the model year 2003 Saturn Ion
23 identified issues with the ignition switch, noting that the two causes of failure were “[l]ow
24 contact force and low detent plunger force.”

25 65. Instead of fixing the defect, GM began manufacturing and selling the Saturn
26 Ion with the ignition system defect in 2002.

27 8 “G.M. Reveals It Was Told of Ignition Defect in ‘01,” D. Ivory, NEW YORK TIMES
28 (Mar. 12, 2014).

1 66. In 2003, an internal report documented an instance in which the service
2 technician observed a stall while driving. The service technician noted that the weight of
3 several keys on the key ring had worn out the ignition switch. It was replaced and the matter
4 was closed.⁹

5 67. According to GM's latest chronology submitted to NHTSA pursuant to 49
6 CFR §573.6, Old GM engineers encountered the problem again in 2004 during test drives of
7 the Chevy Cobalt, before it went to market.

8 68. Old GM opened an engineering inquiry, known as a "Problem Resolution
9 Tracking System inquiry" ("PRTS"), to investigate the issue. According to the chronology
10 provided to NHTSA by GM, engineers pinpointed the problem and were "able to replicate
11 this phenomenon during test drives."

12 69. The Old GM engineers "believed that low key cylinder torque effort was an
13 issue and considered a number of potential solutions." However, after considering cost and
14 the amount of time it would take to develop a fix, Old GM did nothing.

15 70. In 2004, an Old GM engineer observed a Chevrolet Cobalt during testing lose
16 all power when the engineer inadvertently bumped the key in the ignition.¹⁰

17 71. Notwithstanding the knowledge of the defect, Old GM placed the Chevrolet
18 Cobalt into the market in 2005. However, Old GM immediately started getting complaints
19 about sudden loss of power incidents, "including instances in which the key moved out of
20 the 'run' position when a driver inadvertently contacted the key or steering column."¹¹ In
21 response, Old GM opened additional PRTS inquiries.

22 72. In February 2005, as part of the PRTS, Old GM engineers began looking into
23 ways to solve the problem of the key moving from the "run" to the "accessory/off" position
24 during ordinary driving.

25 73. As part of the February 2005 PRTS, Old GM engineers opined that the only

26
27 ⁹ *Id.*
28 ¹⁰ <http://money.cnn.com/infographic/pf/autos/gm-recall-timeline/?iid=EL>
11 March 11, 2014 Chronology Re: Recall of 2006 Chevrolet HHR and Pontiac Solstice,
2003-2007 Saturn Ion, and 2007 Saturn Sky Vehicles, at 1.

1 “sure solution” to fixing the problem of the key inadvertently moving from the “run” to the
2 “accessory/off” position required changing from a low mount to a high lock module, which,
3 according to Old GM engineers would considerably reduce the possibility of the key being
4 impacted by the driver.

5 74. According to Old GM engineers, this change in the key position on the lock
6 module, combined with increasing the detent in the ignition switch,¹² would be a “sure
7 solution.”

8 75. However, Old GM rejected this approach, in part, because the cost to
9 implement the solution would be too high.

10 76. Rather than satisfy its ongoing duty to provide notice of the known safety
11 defect, in February 2005, Old GM issued a Technical Service Bulletin (“TSB”) to its dealers
12 regarding the engine stalling incidents in 2005 Cobalts and 2005 Pontiac G5s (actually
13 related to “Pursuits,” which are the Canadian version of the G5).

14 77. The TSB provided the following recommendations/instructions to its dealers –
15 but not to Plaintiff, the other Class members, or the public in general:

16 There is potential for the driver to inadvertently turn off the ignition due to
17 low key ignition cylinder torque/effort. The concern is more likely to occur
if the driver is short and has a large key chain.

18 In the cases this condition was documented, the driver’s knee would contact
19 the key chain while the vehicle was turning. The steering column was
20 adjusted all the way down. This is more likely to happen to a person that is
short as they will have the seat positioned closer to the steering column.

21 In cases that fit this profile, question the customer thoroughly to determine
22 if this may be the cause. The customer should be advised of this potential
and to take steps, such as removing unessential items from their key chains,
to prevent it.

23 Please follow this diagnosis process thoroughly and complete each step. If
24 the condition exhibited is resolved without completing every step,
remaining steps do not need to be performed.

25 78. At this time, however Old GM knew that the inadvertent turning off of the
26 ignition in the Defective Vehicles was due to the ignition switch defect in those vehicles,
27 and was not limited to short drivers using large heavy key chains.

28 ¹² “Detent” – refers to the device used to mechanically resist the rotation of the ignition.

1 79. Old GM failed to disclose and, in fact, concealed and obscured the problems
2 that uniformly affected all of the Defective Vehicles, electing to wait until customers
3 brought their cars to a dealership after an engine-stalling incident, and offered even its own
4 dealers only an incomplete, incorrect, and insufficient description of the defects and the
5 manner in which to actually remedy them.

6 80. Although it had actual knowledge of the ignition switch defects that it was
7 concealing, Old GM continued to sell hundreds of thousands of Defective Vehicles, reaping
8 profits from those sales from purchasers who were never informed that their vehicles had an
9 ignition switch defect and, therefore, were unable to consider that information in deciding
10 whether to purchase or lease the Defective Vehicles.

11 81. In March 2005, Old GM opened another PRTS after receiving a complaint of
12 a Cobalt's ignition turning off while driving.

13 82. During the March 2005 PRTS, Old GM did not reconsider any of the solutions
14 offered during the February 2005 PRTS. Instead, Old GM decided that the sole corrective
15 action would be to advise customers to remove excess material from their key rings.

16 83. Old GM made this decision despite knowing that the inadvertent turning off of
17 the ignition in the Defective Vehicle was due to design defects, and was not limited to
18 drivers having excess materials on their key ring.

19 84. In May 2005, after yet another complaint, Old GM engineers again assessed
20 the problem and proposed that GM re-design the key head from a "slotted" to a "hole"
21 configuration.

22 85. Despite this initial safety/redesign commitment, Old GM ultimately failed to
23 follow through and closed the May 2005 PRTS without any action, further concealing what
24 it knew from the public and continuing to subject the public – including Plaintiff and the
25 other Class members – to the Defective Vehicles' serious safety risks.

26 86. In or around October 2005, Old GM issued a TSB advising service
27 technicians and GM dealers that the inadvertent turning of the key cylinder was causing the
28 loss of the car's electrical system.

1 87. Specifically, Old GM's October 2005 TSB informed that "GM has analyzed
2 this condition and believes it may occur when a driver overloads a key ring, or when the
3 driver's leg moves amid factors... Depending on these factors, a driver can unintentionally
4 turn the vehicle off."

5 88. Despite making these statements, Old GM knew that the inadvertent turning
6 off of the ignition in the Defective Vehicles was due to the ignition switch defect in those
7 vehicles, and was not caused by heavy key chains or a driver's size and seating position.
8 Old GM knew that removing the non-essential material from key rings would not eliminate
9 the possibility of inadvertent bumping of the ignition key from the "run" to the
10 "accessory/off" position while the car is running.

11 89. Old GM's statements in the October 2005 TSB were demonstrably false and
12 misleading, as Old GM knew that these incidents were ultimately caused by the safety-
13 related defects of the ignition system.

14 90. In December 2005, Old GM issued an additional TSB, which represented that
15 it applied to 2005-06 Chevrolet Cobalts, 2006 Chevrolet HHRs, 2005-2006 Pontiac
16 Pursuit, 2006 Pontiac Solstices, and 2003-2006 Saturn Ions.

17 91. Rather than disclosing the true nature of the defects and correcting them, the
18 December 2005 TSB directed dealers to give customers who brought in their vehicle
19 complaining about the issue "an insert for the key ring so that it goes from a 'slot' design to
20 a hole design" to prevent the key ring from moving up and down in the slot. "[T]he previous
21 key ring" was "replaced with a smaller" one; this change was supposedly able to keep the
22 keys from hanging as low as they had in the past.¹³ According to GM's records, Old GM
23 dealers provided key inserts to 474 customers who brought their vehicles into dealers for
24 service.¹⁴

25 92. As with Old GM's prior statements regarding the Defective Vehicles, the
26 information Old GM provided was false and misleading.

27
28¹³ *Id.* at 1-2.

¹⁴ *Id.* at 3.

1 93. In 2005, rather than issue a recall or provide notice of the known safety
2 related defect as required by, among other things, the TREAD Act, Old GM chose to buy
3 back Cobalts from certain customers who were experiencing engine stalling incidents;
4 however, Old GM never informed the public that it was buying back Cobalts under certain
5 circumstances due to the ignition switch defect. Despite buying back some Cobalts, Old GM
6 refused to buy back Cobalts from other customers for unknown reasons.

7 94. In November 2005, Old GM received notice and opened a file relating to
8 another incident involving a 2005 Cobalt in Baldwin, Louisiana. In that incident the airbags
9 failed to deploy after the Cobalt went off the road and hit a tree.

10 95. In February 2006, Old GM received notice and opened a file relating to
11 another incident involving a 2005 Cobalt in Lanexa, Virginia. In that incident the airbags
12 failed to deploy after the Cobalt went off the road and hit a light pole. A download of the
13 SDM (car's "black box") indicated that the key was in the "accessory/off" position at the
14 time of the crash.

15 96. In March 2006, Old GM received notice and opened a file relating to another
16 incident involving a 2005 Cobalt in Frederick, Maryland. In that incident the airbags failed
17 to deploy after the Cobalt went off the road and hit a utility pole. A download of the SDM
18 indicated that the key was in the "accessory/off" position at the time of the crash.

19 97. In 2006, Old GM approved a design change for the Cobalt's ignition switch
20 supplied by Delphi. The new design included "the use of a new detent plunger and spring
21 that increased torque force in the ignition switch." But the new design was not produced
22 until the 2007 model year.¹⁵

23 98. On August 1, 2006, Old GM opened yet another PRTS after received an
24 additional complaint about a Cobalt stalling; however, as Old GM's common course of
25 action would suggest, Old GM closed the PRTS without taking any action.

26 99. Later that year, in December 2006, a 2005 Cobalt drove off the road and hit a
27 tree in Sellerville, Pennsylvania. The frontal airbags failed to deploy in the accident. Old

28 ¹⁵ *Id.* at 2.

1 GM received notice and opened a file related to the incident.

2 100. On February 6, 2007, in Shaker Township, Pennsylvania, the airbags failed to
3 deploy when a 2006 Cobalt drove off the road and hit a tree. GM received notice of the
4 accident opened a file. A download of the SDM indicated that the key was in the
5 “accessory/off” position at the time of the crash.

6 101. Throughout the remainder of 2007 and 2008, Old GM received notice of
7 numerous other accidents involving Cobalts during which the airbag failed to deploy.

8 102. In 2007, NHTSA investigators met with Old GM to discuss its airbags, and
9 informed Old GM of the July 2005 frontal and fatal crash involving Amber Marie Rose.

10 103. As alleged above, the airbags in Ms. Rose’s 2005 Cobalt did not deploy. Data
11 retrieved from her vehicle’s diagnostic system indicated that the ignition was in the
12 “accessory” position at the time of the accident. Old GM investigated and tracked similar
13 incidents.

14 104. By the end of 2007, by GM’s own admission, Old GM knew of 10 frontal
15 collisions in which the airbag did not deploy.¹⁶ Plaintiff believes that Old GM actually knew
16 of many other similar incidents involving the ignition switch defects.

17 105. For the next six years, GM continued to get complaints and continued to
18 investigate frontal crashes in which the airbags did not deploy. Despite this, GM never
19 satisfied its ongoing duties to disclose material facts to consumers (including those in the
20 Class and subclasses) regarding the defects and safety risks presented, and never undertook
21 to actually fix the defects.

22 **B. GM Investigates But Continues To Conceal**

23 106. In 2010, GM began a formal investigation of the frontal airbag non-
24 deployment incidents in Chevrolet Cobalts and Pontiac G5s.

25 107. In 2012, GM engineers noticed that all crashes in which the ignition was
26 switched out of “run” only happened in cars from the 2007 model year and earlier.

27 108. In May 2012, GM engineers tested the torque on the ignition switches for

28 ¹⁶ Feb. 24, 2014 Attachment B-573.6(c)(6) at 2.

1 Cobalt, G5, HHR, and Ion vehicles that had experienced crashes. The results of the tests
2 revealed that the torque required to turn the ignition switches in most of these vehicles from
3 the “run” to the “accessory/off” position did not meet GM’s minimal torque specification
4 requirements.

5 109. During additional field performance evaluations, GM determined that,
6 although increasing the detent in the ignition switch would reduce the chance that they key
7 would inadvertently move from the “run” to the “accessory/off” position, it would not be a
8 total solution to the problem.

9 110. Despite GM engineers offering numerous ways to fix the problem, GM
10 rejected each of the ideas.

11 111. The GM engineers understood that increasing the detent in the ignition switch
12 alone was not a solution to the problem. However, GM continued to conceal the true nature
13 and extent of the defect.

14 112. On February 7, 2014, after numerous assessments and facing increasing
15 scrutiny of its conduct and the defects in its vehicles, GM finally announced a recall for the
16 Cobalt and G5 vehicles.¹⁷

17 113. Thereafter, on February 24, 2014, GM adds an additional 600,000 Chevrolet
18 HHR, Pontiac Solstice, Saturn Ion and Saturn Sky vehicles to the recall.

19 **C. GM Waited Until 2014 to Finally Order a Recall of the Defective Vehicles.**

20 114. As noted, on February 7, 2014, GM informed NHTSA that it was conducting
21 Recall No. 13454 for certain 2005-2007 model year Chevrolet Cobalts and 2007 model year
22 Pontiac G5 vehicles.

23 115. On February 10, GM announced the recall, which applied to approximately
24 619,122 vehicles.

25 116. Two weeks later, after additional analysis, GM expanded the recall on
26 February 25, 2014 to include an additional 748,024 vehicles: the Chevrolet HHR and
27 Pontiac Solstice for model years 2006 and 2007, the Saturn Ion for model years 2003-2007,

28

¹⁷ *Id.* at 4-5.

1 and the Saturn Sky for model year 2007.

2 117. GM provided dealers with notice of the recall on February 26, 2014 and
3 March 4, 2014 and mailed letters to current owners on March 10 and March 11, 2014.

4 118. Thereafter, on March 28, 2014, GM again expanded the recall to cover all
5 model years of the Chevrolet Cobalt and HHR, the Pontiac G5 and Solstice, and the Saturn
6 Ion and Sky in the United States. This second expansion included an additional 824,000
7 cars bringing the total number of recalled vehicles to roughly 2,191,146.

8 119. According to GM, “the dealers are to replace the ignition switch,”¹⁸ presumably with one with sufficient torque to prevent the inadvertent shut down of the
9 ignition, power steering, power brakes, and airbags.

10 120. In a video message addressed to GM employees on March 17, 2014, C.E.O.
11 Mary Barra admitted that the Company had made mistakes and needed to change its
12 processes.

13 121. According to Ms. Barra, “Something went terribly wrong in our processes in
14 this instance, and terrible things happened.” Barra continued to promise, “We will be better
15 because of this tragic situation if we seize this opportunity.”¹⁹

16 122. GM now faces an investigation by NHTSA, hearings in both the U.S. House
17 and Senate, and a probe by the Department of Justice.

18 123. On March 30, 2014, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations for
19 The Committee on Energy and Commerce (“Subcommittee”) issued a memorandum that
20 provided relevant background information of the ignition switch recall - outlining key facts
21 and events leading up to the ignition switch recall – and formally announcing that on April
22 1, 2014, the Subcommittee would be holding a hearing entitled “The GM Ignition Switch
23 Recall: Why Did it Take So Long?”²⁰

24 124. In addition to the investigation of GM for its failures related to the ignition

25 ¹⁸ *Id.* at 6.

26 ¹⁹ “*Something Went “Very Wrong” at G.M., Chief Says.*” N.Y. TIMES (Mar. 18, 2014).

27 ²⁰ Available at: <http://apps.washingtonpost.com/g/documents/politics/house-committee-on-energy-and-commerce-memorandum-for-hearing-on-the-gm-ignition-switch-recall-why-did-it-take-so-long/908/>

1 switch defects, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (“NHTSA”) is under
2 investigation for its failures related to the same ignition switch defects in the Defective
3 Vehicles.

4 125. For example, in 2007, in response to complaints that had been coming into
5 NHTSA since 2005, the chief of NHTSA’s defects assessment division requested NHTSA
6 to open a formal probe into why air bags in the 2003-2006 model year Cobalts and Saturns
7 were not deploying; however, NHTSA denied the request and decided not to pursue the
8 investigation because it did not see a discernible trend.²¹

9 126. On April 1, 2014, GM went before the Subcommittee. In written testimony
10 provided by Ms. Barra prior to the hearing she admitted that she does not know “why it took
11 years for a safety defect to be announced[,]” adding that GM will be “fully transparent” in
12 regards to the ignition switch defect and GM “will not shirk from [its] responsibilities now
13 and in the future. Today’s GM will do the right thing.”

14 127. At the hearing Ms. Barra faced questioning and comments from members of
15 the Subcommittee.

16 128. U.S. Representative Timothy Murphy stated that “[t]he red flags were there
17 for GM and NHTSA to take action, but for some reason it didn’t happen. To borrow a
18 phrase, what we have here is a failure to communicate, and the results were deadly.”²²

19 129. U.S. Representative Diana DeGette questioned Ms. Barra about GM’s
20 decision to continue selling Defective Vehicles without initiating a recall or fix despite
21 knowing of the defective ignition switches and despite knowing that the Defective Vehicles
22 were unsafe. Specifically, Diana DeGette said that GM elected not to replace a part of that
23 would have cost 57 cents a car because of cost and the lack of “an acceptable business
24 case.” Instead, according to Diana DeGette, “[GM] continued to sell cars knowing they

25
26 ²¹ <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304157204579475300460311892?mg=reno64wsj&url=http%3A%2F%2Fonline.wsj.com%2Farticle%2FSB10001424052702304157204579475300460311892.html>

27
28 ²² http://money.cnn.com/2014/04/01/news/companies/barra-congress-testimony/index.html?hpt=hp_t2

were unsafe," and the Subcommittee is "going to get to the bottom of this."²³

130. Ms. Barra acknowledged that statements in GM's documents from 2005 show
that GM elected not to implement a fix because it was too expensive, noting that the
documents were "very disturbing."²⁴

131. Ms. Barra stated that the decision not to implement a fix over cost concerns
stemmed from operating under a "cost culture" in the days before the 2009 bankruptcy.²⁵

132. During the hearing, Ms. Barra admitted that the defective ignition switches
were installed in Defective Vehicles despite the fact that GM was aware that the ignition
switches did not meet GM's own specifications.²⁶ Ms. Barra added that if parts do not meet
"performance, reliability and safety" standards, they would be recalled.

133. During the hearing, when asked about when GM knew of problems and why
decisions were made, Ms. Barra repeatedly said she did not know the answer.

134. While GM has now appointed a new Vehicle Safety Chief, on information and
belief at least 1.4 million Defective Vehicles remain on the road to this day; and, on
information and belief, other vehicles not yet acknowledged by GM also have the deadly
ignition switch defects.

135. In addition to being inexcusably late, GM's recall is insufficient, as it does not
correct the safety-related defects in the Defective Vehicles.

136. Since at least 2005, GM has known that simply replacing the ignition switches
on the Defective Vehicles is not a solution to the potential for the key to inadvertently turn
from the "run" to the "accessory/off" position in these vehicles.

137. GM's recall fails to address the design defect that causes the key fob/chain to
hang too low on the steering column.

138. Thus, even when the ignition switches are replaced, this defective condition
would still exist in the Defective Vehicles and there continues to be the potential for a driver

23 *Id.*

24 *Id.*

25 *Id.*

26 *Id.*

1 to inadvertently turn the key from the “run” to the “accessory/off” position.

2 139. Additionally, the recall does not call for a replace of every key in the
3 Defective Vehicles with the redesigned key – key that requires a hole instead of a slot.
4 These redesigned keys have been provided to 2010 Cobalt users under the assumption that
5 they reduce the risk of inadvertently turning the ignition from “run” to “accessory/off.”

6 140. Old GM and GM engineers have understood for quite some time that
7 increasing the detent in the ignition switch alone was not a complete solution to the
8 problem. This is evidence by the PRTS reports discussed above.

9 141. Further, the recall fails to address the defect that causes the airbag to be
10 inoperable upon the engine being shut off.

11 **D. Old GM Promoted the Defective Vehicles as Safe and Reliable.**

12 142. In marketing and advertising materials, Old GM consistently promoted the
13 Defective Vehicles as safe and reliable and free of known defects.

14 143. For example, one Cobalt ad promised that “Side curtain airbags coupled with
15 OnStar makes every journey the safest possible to assure that you and your occupants will
16 stay safe at all times.”

17 144. An ad for the 2006 Solstice promises that the vehicle “[b]rings power and
18 defines performance.”

19 145. A 2003 television spot for the Saturn vehicle closed with the tagline
20 “Specifically engineered for whatever is next.” Another 2003 spot closed with the tagline
21 “Saturn. People first.”

22 146. A 2001 print ad touting the launch of the Saturn focused on safety:

23 Need is where you begin. In cars, it’s about things like reliability, durability
24 and, of course, safety. That’s where we started when developing our new
line of cars. And it wasn’t until we were satisfied that we added things....

25 147. Old GM made these representations to boost vehicle sales and maximize
26 profits while knowing that the ignition switches in the Defective Vehicles were defective.

27 148. Throughout the relevant period, Old GM possessed vastly superior knowledge
28 and information to that of consumers – if not exclusive information – about the design and

1 function of the ignition switches in the Defective Vehicles and the existence of the defects
2 in those vehicles.

3 149. Old GM never informed consumers about the ignition switch defects. Such
4 conduct and statement were false, misleading and deceptive.

5 **E. The Ignition Switch Defects have Harmed Plaintiffs and the Class**

6 150. The ignition switch defects have caused damage to Plaintiffs and the Class.

7 151. A vehicle purchased, leased or retained with a serious safety defect is worth
8 less than the equivalent vehicle leased, purchased or retained without the defect.

9 152. A vehicle purchased, leased or retained under the reasonable assumption that
10 it is safe is worth more than a vehicle known to be subject to the unreasonable risk of
11 catastrophic accident because of the ignition switch defects.

12 153. Purchasers and lessees paid more for the Defective Vehicles, through a higher
13 purchase price or higher lease payments, than they would have had the ignition switch
14 defects been disclosed. Plaintiffs and the Class overpaid for their Defective Vehicles.
15 Because of the concealed ignition switch defects. Plaintiffs did not receive the benefit of the
16 bargain.

17 154. Plaintiff and the Class are stuck with unsafe vehicles that are now worth less
18 than they would have been but for GM's failure to disclose the ignition switch defects. Now
19 that the facts regarding the defects have been revealed to the public, reasonable cars buyers
20 would be adverse to buying a Defective Vehicle and would tend to pay less for one of the
21 Defective Vehicles than had it never had the defect.

22 155. GM admits to at least twelve deaths resulting from accidents linked to the
23 ignition switch defects in the Defective Vehicles. However, Plaintiffs believe that the actual
24 number is much higher, and that there may have been hundreds of deaths and injuries
25 attributable to the ignitions switch defects.

26 156. If Old GM or GM had timely disclosed the ignition switch defects as required
27 by, among other things, the TREAD Act all Class members' vehicles would now be worth
28 more.

1 V. SUCCESSOR LIABILITY

2 157. As discussed above, GM expressly assumed certain obligations under, *inter*
3 *alia*, the TREAD Act, and is liable for its non-disclosure of the ignition switch defects from
4 the date of its formation on July 10, 2009.

5 158. GM also expressly assumed liability in the Master Sale and Purchase
6 Agreement of June 26, 2009, and this assumption of liability includes, but is not limited to,
7 the claims of the Class and Subclasses under various consumer protection statutes.

8 159. GM has successor liability for Old GM's acts and omissions in the marketing
9 and sale of the Defective Vehicles because it has continued the business enterprise of Old
10 GM, for the following reasons:

- 11 • GM admits that it knew of the ignition system defects from the very
12 date of its formation;
- 13 • GM has continued in the business of designing, manufacturing, and
14 marketing vehicles, including at least some of the same vehicles as Old
GM;
- 15 • GM retained the bulk of the employees of Old GM;
- 16 • GM acquired owned and leased real property of Old GM, including all
17 machinery, equipment, tools, information technology, product
inventory, and intellectual property;
- 18 • GM acquired the contracts, books, and records of Old GM; and
- 19 • GM acquired all goodwill and other intangible personal property of Old
GM.

20 157. All applicable statutes of limitation have been tolled by GM's knowing and
21 active fraudulent concealment and denial of the facts alleged herein. Plaintiffs and Class
22 members did not discover, and did not know of facts that would have caused a reasonable
23 person to suspect, that Old GM and GM did not report information within their knowledge
24 to federal authorities (NHTSA) or consumers, nor would a reasonable and diligent
25 investigation have disclosed that Old GM and GM had information in their possession about
26 the existence and dangerousness of the defect and opted to conceal that information until
27 shortly before this class action was filed.

28 158. Indeed, Old GM instructed its service shops to provide Defective Vehicle

1 owners with a new key ring if they complained about unintended shut down, rather than
2 admit what Old GM knew – that the ignition switches were dangerously defective and
3 warranted replacement with a properly designed and built ignition system.

4 159. Old GM and GM were, and GM remains, under a continuing duty to disclose
5 to NHTSA, Plaintiffs, and the Class the true character, quality, and nature of the Defective
6 Vehicles; that this defect is based on dangerous, inadequate, and defective design and/or
7 substandard materials; and that it will require repair, poses a severe safety concern, and
8 diminishes the value of the Defective Vehicles.

9 160. Because of the active concealment by Old GM and GM, any and all
10 limitations periods otherwise applicable to Plaintiffs' claims have been tolled.

11 VI. CLASS ALLEGATIONS

12 161. Under Rules 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,
13 Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and a Class initially defined as follows:

14 All persons in the United States who currently own or lease one or more of the
15 following GM vehicles: 2003-2011 Saturn Ion; 2005-2011 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-
16 2011 Pontiac G5; 2006-2011 Chevrolet HHR; 2005-2011 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-2011
Pontiac Solstice; and 2007-2011 Saturn Sky.

17 (the "Class")

18 162. Additionally, Plaintiffs seek to represent the following statewide subclasses:

- 19 • All persons in the State of Arizona who currently own or lease one
20 or more of the following GM vehicles: 2003-2011 Saturn Ion; 2005-
2011 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-2011 Pontiac G5; 2006-2011
Chevrolet HHR; 2005-2011 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-2011 Pontiac
Solstice; and 2007-2011 Saturn Sky (the "Arizona Subclass");
- 22 • All persons in the State of New York who currently own or lease one
23 or more of the following GM vehicles: 2003-2011 Saturn Ion; 2005-
2011 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-2011 Pontiac G5; 2006-2011
Chevrolet HHR; 2005-2011 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-2011 Pontiac
Solstice; and 2007-2011 Saturn Sky (the "New York Subclass");
and,
- 26 • All persons in the State of Michigan who currently own or lease one
27 or more of the following GM vehicles: 2003-2011 Saturn Ion; 2005-
2011 Chevrolet Cobalt; 2005-2011 Pontiac G5; 2006-2011
Chevrolet HHR; 2005-2011 Pontiac Pursuit; 2006-2011 Pontiac
Solstice; and 2007-2011 Saturn Sky (the "Michigan Subclass").

1 (collectively referred to herein as the “Subclasses”).

2 163. The “Class Period” for the Class and any Subclass dates back to January 1,
3 2002, and continues through the present and the date of judgment. Alternatively, “Class
4 Period” for the Class and any Subclass dates back to the length of the longest applicable
5 statute of limitations for any claims asserted on behalf of that Class from the date this action
6 was commenced and continues through the present and the date of judgment. Excluded
7 from the Class are GM, its employees, co-conspirators, officers, directors, legal
8 representatives, heirs, successors and wholly or partly owned subsidiaries or affiliated
9 companies; class counsel and their employees; any individuals who experienced physical
10 injuries as a result of the defects at issue in this litigation; and the judge and court staff to
11 whom this case is assigned. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend the definition of the class if
12 discovery or further investigation reveals that the class should be expanded or otherwise
13 modified.

14 164. All requirements for class certification in Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a), 23(b)(1),
15 23(b)(2) and/or 23(b)(3) (or any other applicable state or federal rule of civil procedure) are
16 satisfied with respect to the Class and each Subclass.

17 165. Numerosity of the Class. Members of the Class and each Subclass are so
18 numerous that their individual joinder herein is impracticable. The precise number of
19 members of the Class and each Subclass and their addresses are presently unknown to
20 Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs are informed and believe that GM has manufactured and sold millions
21 of Defective Vehicles Nationwide and Statewide. Plaintiffs therefore allege that the total
22 number of members of the Class and each Subclass is well in excess of 500 persons and/or
23 entities who would fall within the proposed class definition.

24 166. Ascertainable Class. The community of interest among these class members
25 in the litigation is well defined and the proposed classes are ascertainable from objective
26 criteria. If necessary to preserve the case as a class action, the court itself can redefine the
27 Class and any Subclass.

1 167. Common Questions of Fact and Law Exist and Predominate over Individual
2 Issues. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact
3 involved affecting the parties to be represented. These common questions of law and fact
4 exist as to all members of the Class and Subclasses and predominate over the questions
5 affecting only individual members of the classes. These common legal and factual
6 questions include without limitation:

- 7 a. Whether the Defective Vehicles suffer from ignition switch defects;
- 8 b. Whether Old GM and GM concealed the defects;
- 9 c. Whether Old GM and GM misrepresented that the Defective Vehicles
10 were safe;
- 11 d. Whether Old GM and GM engaged in fraud, fraudulent concealment,
12 and made fraudulent misrepresentations to the public;
- 13 e. Whether Old GM and GM engaged in unfair, deceptive, unlawful
14 and/or fraudulent acts or practices in trade or commerce by failing to
15 disclose that the Defective Vehicles were designed, manufactured, and
16 sold with defective ignition switches;
- 17 f. Whether the alleged conduct by GM violated laws as Plaintiff alleges;
- 18 g. Whether Old GM's and GM's unlawful, unfair and/or deceptive
19 practices harmed Plaintiff and the members of the Class and
20 Subclasses;
- 21 h. Whether Plaintiff and members of the Class and Subclasses are entitled
22 to damages;
- 23 i. Whether Plaintiff and the members of the Class are entitled to equitable
24 and/or injunctive relief; and
- 25 j. Whether, and to what extent, GM has successor liability for the acts
26 and omissions of Old GM;

27 168. GM has engaged in a common course of conduct giving rise to the legal rights
28 sought to be enforced by Plaintiffs individually and on behalf of the other members of the

1 Class and Subclasses. Similar or identical statutory and common law violations, business
2 practices, and injuries are involved as to all members in the Class and Subclasses.
3 Individual questions, if any, pale by comparison, in both quality and quantity, to the
4 numerous common questions that dominate this action.

5 169. Plaintiffs are members of and present claims that are typical of the claims of
6 members of the Class and the Subclass. Plaintiffs owned or leased one of GM's Defective
7 Vehicles. The safety related defects in Plaintiffs' Vehicle are the same as those in other
8 Class and Subclass members' Vehicle. Plaintiffs and all Class and Subclass members each
9 sustained damages arising from GM's wrongful conduct, as alleged more fully herein. The
10 same material facts that GM withheld from the Plaintiffs were withheld from the other
11 members of the Class and Subclasses. The test for materiality is an objective test subject to
12 class wide proof.

13 170. All members of the Class and Subclasses have been the subject of GM's
14 unfair and unlawful business practices as described herein. The relief sought is common,
15 unitary, and class-wide in nature.

16 171. Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent
17 and protect the interest of the members of the Class and each Subclass. Plaintiffs share a
18 common interest with all Plaintiff class members, with respect to the conduct of GM herein,
19 and redress of same. Plaintiffs have suffered an injury-in-fact as a result of the conduct of
20 GM, as alleged herein. Plaintiffs have retained counsel who are competent and experienced
21 in the prosecution of complex consumer fraud, mass tort and class actions. Plaintiffs and
22 their counsel intend to prosecute this action vigorously and faithfully for the benefit of the
23 Class and Subclass members. Plaintiffs have no interests contrary to the class members,
24 and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the classes.

25 172. Community of Interest. The proposed classes have a well-defined community
26 of interest in the questions of fact and law to be litigated. The common questions of law
27 and fact are predominant with respect to the liability issues, relief issues and anticipated
28

1 affirmative defenses. The Named Plaintiffs have claims typical of the Class and each
2 Subclass.

3 173. Superiority of Class Adjudication. The certification of a classes in this action
4 is superior to the litigation of a multitude of cases by members of the putative classes. Class
5 adjudication will conserve judicial resources and will avoid the possibility of inconsistent
6 rulings. Moreover, there are class members who are unlikely to join or bring an action due
7 to, among other reasons, their reluctance to sue GM and/or their inability to afford a
8 separate action. Equity dictates that all persons who stand to benefit from the relief sought
9 herein should be subject to the lawsuit and hence subject to an order spreading the costs of
10 the litigation among the class members in relationship to the benefits received. Even if the
11 members of the classes themselves could afford individual litigation, the court system could
12 not. Individualized litigation presents a potential for inconsistent or contradictory
13 judgments. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties and the
14 court system presented by the complex legal and factual issues of the case. By contrast, the
15 class action device presents far fewer management difficulties, and provides the benefits of
16 single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

17 174. In the alternative, the above-defined Class and Subclasses may be certified
18 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1) and (b)(2) because:

- 19 a. The prosecution of separate actions by the individual members of the Class
20 and each Subclass would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudication
21 with respect to individual class members' claims which would establish
22 incompatible standards of conduct for GM;
- 23 b. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the classes
24 would create a risk of adjudications which would as a practical matter be
25 dispositive of the interests of other members of the classes who are not parties
26 to the adjudications, or which would substantially impair or impede the ability
27 of other class members to protect their interests; and,

c. Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the classes, thereby making appropriate final and injunctive relief with respect to the Class and each State Subclass.

VII. INTENT

175. GM knowingly and intentionally committed the acts, concealments and material omissions alleged herein. All actions and omissions by GM were willful and not the result of mistake or inadvertence. At all times relevant, Defendant was aware of the defective nature of their Vehicles. Despite this, GM knowingly and intentionally undertook and directed that their respective business undertake the illicit practices and conceal the material facts which are the subject of this suit.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Violation of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act (“MMWA”)
15 U.S.C. §§2301 *et seq.*
(Brought on behalf of Nationwide Class)

176. Plaintiffs and the Class incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as though fully stated herein.

177. Plaintiffs bring this Count on behalf of the Nationwide Class.

178. This Court has jurisdiction to hear and decide this claim by virtue of 28
U.S.C. §1332(a)-(d).

179. Plaintiffs are consumers within the meaning of the MMWA, 15 U.S.C. §2301(3).

180. Old GM and GM are suppliers and warrantors as those terms are defined within the MMWA, 15 U.S.C. §2301(4)-(5).

181. The Defective Vehicles are consumer products within the meaning of the MMWA, 15 U.S.C. §2301(1).

182. 15 U.S.C. §2301(d)(1) provides any consumer with a cause of action when the consumer is damaged by the failure of a warrantor to comply with a written or implied warranty.

1 183. GM and Old GM's express warranties are written warranties within the
2 meaning of the MMWA, 15 U.S.C. §2301(6). The Defective Vehicles' implied warranties
3 are covered under 15 U.S.C. §2301(7).

4 184. Old GM and GM breached these warranties by and through the above
5 described conduct. The Defective Vehicles all share a common design defect in that they
6 contain a defective ignition system that can cause the Defective Vehicles to suddenly fail
7 during normal operation, leaving occupants of the Defective Vehicles, as well as the general
8 public, vulnerable to crashes, serious injury, and death. GM has admitted that the Defective
9 Vehicles are defective in issuing its recall.

10 185. Plaintiffs and each of the other Class members is in privity with GM, as
11 Plaintiffs and each Class member had sufficient dealings with GM, Old GM and/or its
12 agents (dealerships). Nonetheless, privity is not required, as Plaintiffs and all Class
13 members are the intended third-party beneficiary of contracts between GM and/or Old GM
14 and its dealers, specifically, GM's and Old GM's implied warranties. Also, privity is not
15 required because the Defective Vehicles are dangerous instrumentalities due to the
16 aforementioned defects and nonconformities.

17 186. Affording GM a reasonable opportunity to cure its breach of warranties would
18 be unnecessary and futile here. At the time of sale or lease of each Defective Vehicle, GM
19 or Old GM knew, should have known, or was reckless in not knowing of its
20 misrepresentations concerning the Defective Vehicles' nonconformity and inability to
21 perform as warranted. However, Old GM or GM failed to disclose the known defects to
22 consumer and/or the general public.

23 187. Under the circumstances, the remedies available under any informal
24 settlement procedure would be inadequate and any requirement that Plaintiffs resort to an
25 informal dispute resolution procedure and/or afford GM a reasonable opportunity to cure its
26 breach of warranties is excused and thereby deemed satisfied.

27 188. Plaintiffs and Class members would suffer economic hardship if they returned
28 their Defective Vehicles while not receiving the return of all payment made by them to GM

1 and/or Old GM. GM is refusing to revoke acceptance and return all payment made
2 immediately. As such, Plaintiffs and Class members retention of their Defective Vehicles
3 does not equate to a re-acceptance of their Defective Vehicles.

4 189. The amount in controversy of Plaintiffs' individual claims meets or exceeds
5 the sum of \$25. The amount in controversy of this action exceeds the sum of \$50,000,
6 exclusive of interest and costs, computed on the basis of all claims to be determined in this
7 lawsuit. Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of the other Class members, seek all damages
8 permitted by law, including diminution in value of their vehicles, in an amount to be proven
9 at trial.

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **Fraudulent Concealment**
12 **(Brought on behalf of the Nationwide Class)**

13 190. Plaintiffs and the Class incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs as
14 though fully stated herein.

15 191. This claim is brought on behalf of the Nationwide Class.

16 192. GM concealed and suppressed material facts concerning the ignition switch
17 defects, and GM also has successor liability for the acts of concealment and oppression of
18 Old GM as set forth above (as such, the Companies are referred to collectively in this Count
19 as "GM").

20 193. GM intentionally concealed material facts from Plaintiffs, the other Class
21 members, the public, and NHTSA. GM knew that the Defective Vehicles were designed and
22 manufactured with ignition switch defects, but GM intentionally concealed those material
23 facts. Although the Defective vehicles contain material safety defects that GM knew of, or
24 should have known of, at the time of distribution, GM recklessly manufactured and
25 distributed those vehicles to consumers in the United States. Those consumers had no
26 knowledge of the defects.

27 194. Notwithstanding GM's knowledge of the design defects and inherent safety
28 risks in their Defective Vehicles, and their knowledge of designs that could eliminate the

1 defects or lessen the safety hazards, at all times since at least 2001 and continuing through
2 the Class Period, GM failed and refused to alter their Defective Vehicles ignition switch
3 design, and instead engaged in a continuous pattern of deception, suppression and
4 concealment of material facts, designed to mislead Plaintiffs and Class members into
5 believing that the Defective Vehicles they owned were safe.

6 195. Rather than provide consumers with complete and accurate information based
7 on their exclusive and superior knowledge regarding the ignition switch defects –
8 particularly the accident reports involving the non-deployment of airbags in frontal
9 collisions - GM, engaged in a continuing and consistent pattern and practice of deception
10 and concealment, up to and through the Class Period, to mislead consumers into believing
11 GM's products were defect-free and safe to use. As a result, consumers had no knowledge
12 of the true nature and extent of the safety risks involved in continuing to use GM's
13 Defective Vehicles.

14 196. GM had a duty to disclose material facts to Plaintiffs and Class regarding the
15 ongoing dangers of the Defective Vehicles at all times before and during the Class Period.
16 GM's duty to disclose the ignition switch defects stemmed from the fact that the defects
17 were known and/or accessible only to GM who had superior knowledge and access to the
18 facts, and GM knew they were not known to or reasonably discoverable by Plaintiffs and
19 the Class. These omitted and concealed facts were material because they directly impact the
20 safety of the Defective Vehicles. Whether an ignition switch was designed and
21 manufactured with appropriate safeguards is a material safety concern.

22 197. Such disclosures should have been provided to Plaintiffs and each Class
23 member in the state in which they reside. Each day in which GM did not do this constitutes
24 an actionable offence in the state in which the Plaintiffs and Class member resides. GM's
25 failure to disclose all material facts to Plaintiffs and the Class prevented Plaintiffs and the
26 Class from being able to discover the truth about the dangerous products, despite reasonable
27 diligence, and to take further steps to protect themselves, their property and to assert their
28 rights.

198. Up to the date of GM's recall, GM had continued its concealment and suppression by failing to inform the public about the true nature and scope of the defects and safety risks inherent in the use of their Defective Vehicles.

199. GM actively concealed and/or suppressed these material facts, in whole or in part, to protect their profits and avoid a costly recall, and they did so at the expense of Plaintiffs and the Class.

200. On information and belief, GM has still not made full and adequate disclosure and continues to defraud Plaintiffs and the Class and conceal material information regarding the defects that exist in the Defective Vehicles and other GM vehicles.

201. Plaintiffs and the Class were unaware of these omitted material facts and would not have acted as they did if they had known of the concealed and/or suppressed facts. Plaintiffs' and the Class's actions were justified. GM was in exclusive control of the material facts and such facts were not known to the public, Plaintiffs, or the Class.

202. Because of the concealment and/or suppression of the facts, Plaintiffs and the Class sustained damage because they purchased and retained vehicles that are now diminished in value from what they would have been had Old GM or GM timely disclosed the ignition switch defects.

203. GM's acts were done maliciously, oppressively, deliberately, with intent to defraud, and in reckless disregard of Plaintiffs' and the Class's rights and well-being to enrich the Companies. GM's conduct warrants an assessment of punitive damages in an amount sufficient to deter such conduct in the future, which amount is to be determined according to proof.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

**Violation of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act, A.R.S. §§44-1522 *et seq.*
(Brought on behalf of the Arizona State Subclass)**

204. Plaintiffs and the Class incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

1 205. Plaintiff Phillip brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of the
2 Arizona State Subclass against GM for violations of the Arizona Consumer Fraud Act -
3 A.R.S. §44-1522 (“ACFA”).

4 206. GM also has successor liability for Old GM’s unfair, unconscionable, and
5 deceptive acts or practices as outline above and in this count. As such, both Old GM and
6 GM are referred to collectively in this Count as “GM.”

7 207. This claim is based on GM’s deceptive and misleading conduct and common
8 omissions of material fact.

9 208. Plaintiff Phillip and each member of the Arizona Subclass is a “person” as
10 defined in section 44-1521 of the ACFA.

11 209. GM engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices that violated ACFA.

12 210. Plaintiff Phillip and other Subclass members were deceived by GM’s failure
13 to disclose that the Defective Vehicles share a common design defect in that they are
14 equipped with defective ignition switches that can suddenly fail during normal operation,
15 leaving occupants of the Defective Vehicles vulnerable to crashes, serious injury, and death.
16 GM has admitted that the Defective Vehicles are defective by issuing its recall.

17 211. The Defective Vehicles, each of them, owned or leased by Plaintiff and
18 Subclass members contains an inherent defect, which is substantially likely to result in
19 malfunction when used as reasonably anticipated and intended.

20 212. By manufacturing, marketing and distributing for sale the Defective Vehicles,
21 GM engaged in trade or commerce, the sale of goods, and/or practices affecting commerce
22 within the meaning of the ACFA.

23 213. By failing to disclose and concealing the defective nature of the Defective
24 Vehicles from Plaintiff Phillip and Arizona Subclass members, GM has engaged in
25 deceptive, unfair, fraudulent, and misleading acts and practices in connection with
26 consumer transactions, as GM has represented that its Defective Vehicles had
27 characteristics and benefits that they do not have, and represented that its Defective
28 Vehicles were of a particular standard, quality or grade when they were of another.

1 214. The deceptive and misleading acts have a broad, public impact on consumers
2 at large and does harm to the public interest.

3 215. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and were not
4 suitable for their intended use. GM also knew that the design defects in its Defective
5 Vehicles created and constituted a serious safety hazard. Further, GM knew that the design
6 defects and safety hazards in its Defective Vehicles could be substantially decreased, if not
7 totally eliminated, by the adoption of alternate designs readily available in the market.

8 216. Notwithstanding GM's knowledge of the design defects and inherent safety
9 risks in Defective Vehicles, and its knowledge of alternate designs to eliminate the defects
10 and safety hazards, GM failed and refused to alter the design of the ignition switch systems
11 in the Defective Vehicles, and instead engaged in a continuous pattern of deception and
12 concealment, designed to mislead Plaintiff Phillip and members of the Arizona Subclass
13 into believing that its Defective Vehicles were safe, when in fact they were, and continue to
14 be, dangerously defective.

15 217. GM, at all times up to the filing of this Complaint, has engaged in
16 concealment and misrepresentation which misleads Plaintiffs and all members of the
17 Arizona Subclass into believing that GM's Defective Vehicles were either free of defects
18 are safe to operate. As a result of GM's concealment and misrepresentation, Plaintiffs did
19 not know, and could not through the exercise of reasonable diligence be expected to know,
20 of the defects and safety risks involved in their use of GM's Defective Vehicles.

21 218. Despite reasonable diligence, neither Plaintiff Phillip, nor any reasonable
22 consumer acting in the ordinary course of use, including Class members, could learn the
23 facts GM knowingly concealed from the general public. The defective ignition switch
24 systems are not readily apparent or visible to Class members using the Defective Vehicles
25 as intended in the ordinary course. The only time a risk becomes apparent is when a vehicle
26 experiences an issue related to the defective ignitions. By that time, it is too late for
27 Plaintiff Phillip and Arizona Subclass members, like other reasonable consumers, to take

1 practical steps to protect themselves and their property from the danger associated with the
2 defect.

3 219. GM's unfair and deceptive acts and/or practices occurred repeatedly in GM's
4 trade or business, were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public,
5 and imposed a serious safety risk on the public.

6 220. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and/or
7 manufactured and were not fit for their intended purpose. Despite this, GM marketed and
8 sold these Defective Vehicles to the Class for financial gain.

9 221. GM was under an ongoing and continuous duty to Plaintiff Phillip and the
10 Arizona Subclass Members to disclose the defective nature of their Vehicles because:

- 11 a. GM was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the
12 safety defects in its Defective Vehicles;
- 13 b. Plaintiff Phillip and Arizona Subclass members could not reasonably
14 have been expected to learn or discover that the Defective Vehicles had
15 dangerous safety defects until they manifested failure; and,
- 16 c. GM knew that Plaintiff Phillip and Arizona Subclass members could
17 not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover the safety
18 defects in the Defective Vehicles.

19 222. As described herein, GM has engaged in consumer-oriented conduct that was
20 materially misleading and generally directed at the consuming public.

21 223. Proof of individual reliance or individual injury on the part of absent Class
22 members is not required to establish a basis for relief under ACFA.

23 224. In failing to disclose the defects in its Defective Vehicles, GM knowingly and
24 intentionally concealed material facts and breached their duty not to do so.

25 225. The facts concealed or not disclosed by GM to Plaintiff Phillip and members
26 of the Arizona Subclass are material in that reasonable consumers would have considered
27 them to be important in deciding whether to purchase (or retain) GM's Defective Vehicles
28 or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiff Phillip and the Subclass members known of true extent

1 of the defective nature of the Defective Vehicles, they would not have purchased (or
2 retained) the vehicles, or would have paid less for them.

3 226. GM intended for Plaintiff Phillip and Arizona Subclass members to rely on it
4 to provide safe, adequate designed, and adequately manufactured automobiles and to
5 honestly and accurately reveal the problems described throughout this Complaint.

6 227. Further, Plaintiff Phillip and members of the Arizona Subclass reasonably
7 expected that GM's Defective Vehicles would function safely and not be susceptible to the
8 hazards described within. That is the reasonable and objective consumer expectation for
9 Defective Vehicles.

10 228. Plaintiff Phillip and other Arizona Subclass members have suffered injury in
11 fact and actual damages resulting from GM's material omissions and misrepresentations
12 because they paid an inflated purchase price for the Defective Vehicles.

13 229. Plaintiff Phillip's and Arizona Subclass members' injuries were proximately
14 caused by GM's deceptive acts or practices. The resulting damage and injury is common to
15 Plaintiff Phillip and all Arizona Subclass members and can only be adequately remedied
16 through the common, class-wide relief sought herein.

17 230. Plaintiff Phillip and the Arizona Subclass members are entitled to legal and
18 equitable relief against GM, including injunctions, consequential damages, rescission,
19 restitution, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, prejudgment interest and other relief as appropriate.

20 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Violation of New York's Consumer Protection from Deceptive Acts and Practices** 22 **Statute, N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §§349 *et seq.*** 23 **(Brought on behalf of the New York State Subclass)**

24 231. Plaintiff and the Class incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of
this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

25 232. Plaintiff Torres brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of the
26 Class against GM for violations of New York's Consumer Protection from Deceptive Acts
27 and Practices Statute - N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law §349 *et seq.* ("GBL §349").

1 233. GM also has successor liability for Old GM's unfair, unconscionable, and
2 deceptive acts or practices as outline above and in this count. As such, both Old GM and
3 GM are referred to collectively in this Count as "GM."

4 234. This claim is based on GM's deceptive and misleading conduct and common
5 omissions of material fact.

6 235. Plaintiff Torres and each member of the New York Subclass is a "consumer"
7 as defined in GBL §349.

8 236. GM engaged in unfair or deceptive acts or practices that violated GBL §349.

9 237. Plaintiff Torres and other New York Subclass members were deceived by
10 GM's failure to disclose that the Defective Vehicles share a common design defect in that
11 they are equipped with defective ignition switches that can suddenly fail during normal
12 operation, leaving occupants of the Defective Vehicles vulnerable to crashes, serious injury,
13 and death. GM has admitted that the Defective Vehicles are defective by issuing its recall.

14 238. The Defective Vehicles, each of them, owned or leased by Plaintiff Torres and
15 the members of the New York Subclass contain an inherent defect, which is substantially
16 likely to result in malfunction when used as reasonably anticipated and intended.

17 239. By manufacturing, marketing and distributing for sale the Defective Vehicles,
18 GM engaged in trade or commerce, the sale of goods, and/or practices affecting commerce
19 within the meaning of the GBL §349.

20 240. By failing to disclose and concealing the defective nature of the Defective
21 Vehicles from Plaintiff Torres and New York Subclass members, GM has engaged in
22 deceptive, unfair, fraudulent, and misleading acts and practices in connection with
23 consumer transactions, as GM has represented that its Defective Vehicles had
24 characteristics and benefits that they do not have, and represented that its Defective
25 Vehicles were of a particular standard, quality or grade when they were of another.

26 241. The deceptive and misleading acts have a broad, public impact on consumers
27 at large and does harm to the public interest.

1 242. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and were not
2 suitable for their intended use. GM also knew that the design defects in its Defective
3 Vehicles created and constituted a serious safety hazard. Further, GM knew that the design
4 defects and safety hazards in its Defective Vehicles could be substantially decreased, if not
5 totally eliminated, by the adoption of alternate designs readily available in the market.

6 243. Notwithstanding GM's knowledge of the design defects and inherent safety
7 risks in Defective Vehicles, and its knowledge of alternate designs to eliminate the defects
8 and safety hazards, GM failed and refused to alter the design of the ignition switch systems
9 in the Defective Vehicles, and instead engaged in a continuous pattern of deception and
10 concealment, designed to mislead Plaintiff Torres and members of the New York Subclass
11 into believing that its Defective Vehicles were safe, when in fact they were, and continue to
12 be, dangerously defective.

13 244. GM, at all times up to the filing of this Complaint, has engaged in
14 concealment and misrepresentation which misleads Plaintiff Torres and all members of the
15 New York Subclass into believing that GM's Defective Vehicles were either free of defects
16 are safe to operate. As a result of GM's concealment and misrepresentation, Plaintiff Torres
17 and all members of the New York Subclass did not know, and could not through the
18 exercise of reasonable diligence be expected to know, of the defects and safety risks
19 involved in their use of GM's Defective Vehicles.

20 245. Despite reasonable diligence, neither Plaintiff Torres, nor any reasonable
21 consumer acting in the ordinary course of use, including New York Subclass members,
22 could learn the facts GM knowingly concealed from the general public. The defective
23 ignition switch systems are not readily apparent or visible to Class members using the
24 Defective Vehicles as intended in the ordinary course. The only time a risk becomes
25 apparent is when a vehicle experiences an issue related to the defective ignitions. By that
26 time, it is too late for Plaintiff Torres and members of the New York Subclass, like other
27 reasonable consumers, to take practical steps to protect themselves and their property from
28 the danger associated with the defect.

1 246. GM's unfair and deceptive acts and/or practices occurred repeatedly in GM's
2 trade or business, were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public,
3 and imposed a serious safety risk on the public.

4 247. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and/or
5 manufactured and were not fit for their intended purpose. Despite this, GM marketed and
6 sold these Defective Vehicles to the Class for financial gain.

7 248. GM was under an ongoing and continuous duty to Plaintiff Torres and
8 members of the New York Subclass to disclose the defective nature of their Vehicles
9 because:

- 10 a. GM was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the
11 safety defects in its Defective Vehicles;
- 12 b. Plaintiff Torres and New York Subclass members could not reasonably
13 have been expected to learn or discover that the Defective Vehicles had
14 dangerous safety defects until they manifested failure; and,
- 15 c. GM knew that Plaintiff Torres and New York Subclass members could
16 not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover the safety
17 defects in the Defective Vehicles.

18 249. As described herein, GM has engaged in consumer-oriented conduct that was
19 materially misleading and generally directed at the consuming public.

20 250. Proof of individual reliance or individual injury on the part of absent New
21 York Subclass members is not required to establish a basis for relief under GBL §349.

22 251. In failing to disclose the defects in its Defective Vehicles, GM knowingly and
23 intentionally concealed material facts and breached their duty not to do so.

24 252. The facts concealed or not disclosed by GM to Plaintiff Torres and members
25 of the New York Subclass are material in that reasonable consumers would have considered
26 them to be important in deciding whether to purchase (or retain) GM's Defective Vehicles
27 or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiff Torres and the New York Subclass members known of
28

1 true extent of the defective nature of the Defective Vehicles, they would not have purchased
2 (or retained) the vehicles, or would have paid less for them.

3 253. GM intended for Plaintiff Torres and New York Subclass members to rely on
4 it to provide safe, adequate designed, and adequately manufactured automobiles and to
5 honestly and accurately reveal the problems described throughout this Complaint.

6 254. Further, Plaintiff Torres and members of the New York Subclass reasonably
7 expected that GM's Defective Vehicles would function safely and not be susceptible to the
8 hazards described within. That is the reasonable and objective consumer expectation for
9 Defective Vehicles.

10 255. Plaintiff Torres and the New York Subclass members have suffered injury in
11 fact and actual damages resulting from GM's material omissions and misrepresentations
12 because they paid an inflated purchase price for the Defective Vehicles.

13 256. Plaintiff Torres' and New York Subclass members' injuries were proximately
14 caused by GM's deceptive acts or practices. The resulting damage and injury is common to
15 Plaintiff Torres and all New York Subclass members and can only be adequately remedied
16 through the common, class-wide relief sought herein.

17 257. Plaintiff Torres and the New York Subclass members are entitled to legal and
18 equitable relief against GM, including injunctions, consequential damages, rescission,
19 restitution, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, prejudgment interest and other relief as appropriate.

20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

21 **Violation of Michigan Consumer Protection Act, Mich. Comp. Laws §§445.903 *et seq.***
22 **(Brought on behalf of the Michigan State Subclass)**

23 258. Plaintiffs and the Class incorporate by reference all preceding paragraphs of
24 this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

25 259. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of
26 the Michigan State Subclass against GM for violations of Michigan Consumer Protection
27 Act – Mich. Comp. Laws §445.903 (“MCPA”).

1 260. This claim is based on GM's and Old GM's unfair, unconscionable, deceptive
2 and misleading conduct and common omissions of material fact.

3 261. GM also has successor liability for Old GM's unfair, unconscionable, and
4 deceptive acts or practices as outline above and in this count. As such, both Old GM and
5 GM are referred to collectively in this Count as "GM."

6 262. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and each member of the Michigan State Subclass are
7 "persons" as defined by the MCPA.

8 263. Additionally, GM is a "persons" as defined by the MCPA.

9 264. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and other Michigan Subclass members were deceived by
10 GM's failure to disclose that the Defective Vehicles share a common design defect in that
11 they are equipped with defective ignition switches that can suddenly fail during normal
12 operation, leaving occupants of the Defective Vehicles vulnerable to crashes, serious injury,
13 and death. GM has admitted that the Defective Vehicles are defective by issuing its recall.

14 265. The Defective Vehicles, each of them, owned or leased by Plaintiff
15 Kirkpatrick and Michigan Subclass members contains an inherent defect, which is
16 substantially likely to result in malfunction when used as reasonably anticipated and
17 intended.

18 266. By manufacturing, marketing and distributing for sale the Defective Vehicles,
19 GM engaged in trade or commerce, the sale of goods, and/or practices affecting commerce
20 within the meaning of the MCPA.

21 267. By failing to disclose and concealing the defective nature of the Defective
22 Vehicles from Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and the Michigan Subclass members, GM has engaged
23 in deceptive, unfair, fraudulent, and misleading acts and practices in connection with
24 consumer transactions, as GM has represented that its Defective Vehicles had
25 characteristics and benefits that they do not have, and represented that its Defective
26 Vehicles were of a particular standard, quality or grade when they were of another.

27 268. Additionally, GM engaged in deceptive, unfair, fraudulent, and misleading
28 acts and practices in connection with consumer transactions, as GM advertised or

1 represented the Defective Vehicles with intent not to supply the Defective Vehicles as
2 advertised.

3 269. Specifically, GM has violated Mich. Comp. Laws §445.903(1)(c), (e), (g), (s),
4 and (cc) through the acts alleged herein and above, thereby entitling Plaintiff and members
5 of the class to relief under the MCPA, *inter alia*:

- 6 a. Representing that the Defective Vehicles have characteristics which
7 they do not have, in violation of §445.903(1)(c);
- 8 b. Representing that the Defective Vehicles were or a particular standard,
9 quality, or grade when they are of another in violation of
10 §445.903(1)(e); and
- 11 c. Advertising the Defective Vehicles with intent not to sell them as
12 advertised in violation of §445.903(1)(g);
- 13 d. Failing to reveal material facts, the omission of which tends to mislead
14 or deceive, and actually did mislead and deceive Plaintiff Kirkpatrick
15 and all Michigan Subclass members, and which fact could not
16 reasonably by known by Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and all Michigan
17 Subclass members in violation of §445.903(1)(s);
- 18 e. Making a representation of fact or statement of fact material to the
19 transaction such that a person reasonably believes the represented or
20 suggested state of affairs to be other than it actually is in violation of
21 §445.903(1)(bb); and
- 22 f. Failing to reveal facts that are material to the transaction in light of the
23 representations GM made in a positive manner in advertisements in
24 violation of §445.903(1)(cc).

25 270. GM's deceptive and misleading acts have a broad, public impact on
26 consumers at large and does harm to the public interest.

27 271. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and were not
28 suitable for their intended use. GM also knew that the design defects in its Defective

1 Vehicles created and constituted a serious safety hazard. Further, GM knew that the design
2 defects and safety hazards in its Defective Vehicles could be substantially decreased, if not
3 totally eliminated, by the adoption of alternate designs readily available in the market.

4 272. Notwithstanding GM's knowledge of the design defects and inherent safety
5 risks in Defective Vehicles, and its knowledge of alternate designs to eliminate the defects
6 and safety hazards, GM failed and refused to alter the design of the ignition switch systems
7 in the Defective Vehicles, and instead engaged in a continuous pattern of deception and
8 concealment, designed to mislead Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and all members of the Michigan
9 Subclass into believing that its Defective Vehicles were safe, when in fact they were, and
10 continue to be, dangerously defective.

11 273. GM, at all times up to the filing of this Complaint, has engaged in
12 concealment and misrepresentation which misleads Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and all members
13 of the Michigan Subclass into believing that GM's Defective Vehicles were either free of
14 defects or safe to operate. As a result of GM's concealment and misrepresentation,
15 Plaintiff Kirkpatrick did not know, and could not through the exercise of reasonable
16 diligence be expected to know, of the defects and safety risks involved in their use of GM's
17 Defective Vehicles.

18 274. Despite reasonable diligence, neither Plaintiff Kirkpatrick, nor any reasonable
19 consumer acting in the ordinary course of use, including the Michigan Subclass members,
20 could learn the facts GM knowingly concealed from the general public. The defective
21 ignition switch systems are not readily apparent or visible to Michigan Subclass members
22 using the Defective Vehicles as intended in the ordinary course. The only time a risk
23 becomes apparent is when a vehicle experiences an issue related to the defective ignitions.
24 By that time, it is too late for Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and members of the Michigan Subclass,
25 like other reasonable consumers, to take practical steps to protect themselves and their
26 property from the danger associated with the defect.

27
28

1 275. GM's unfair and deceptive acts and/or practices occurred repeatedly in GM's
2 trade or business, were capable of deceiving a substantial portion of the purchasing public,
3 and imposed a serious safety risk on the public.

4 276. GM knew that its Defective Vehicles were defectively designed and/or
5 manufactured and were not fit for their intended purpose. Despite this, GM marketed and
6 sold these Defective Vehicles to the Class for financial gain.

7 277. GM was under an ongoing and continuous duty to Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and
8 the Michigan Subclass members to disclose the defective nature of their Vehicles because:

- 9 a. GM was in a superior position to know the true state of facts about the
10 safety defects in its Defective Vehicles;
- 11 b. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and all members of the Michigan Subclass could
12 not reasonably have been expected to learn or discover that the
13 Defective Vehicles had dangerous safety defects until they manifested
14 failure; and,
- 15 c. GM knew that Plaintiffs and Class members could not reasonably have
16 been expected to learn or discover the safety defects in the Defective
17 Vehicles.

18 278. As described herein, GM has engaged in consumer-oriented conduct that was
19 materially misleading and generally directed at the consuming public.

20 279. Proof of individual reliance or individual injury on the part of absent
21 Michigan Subclass members is not required to establish a basis for relief under MCPA.

22 280. In any event, to the extent individual reliance is required, reliance is presumed
23 in cases involving omissions of material fact.

24 281. In failing to disclose the defects in its Defective Vehicles, GM knowingly and
25 intentionally concealed material facts and breached their duty not to do so.

26 282. The facts concealed or not disclosed by GM to Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and
27 members of the Michigan Subclass are material in that reasonable consumers would have
28 considered them to be important in deciding whether to purchase (or retain) GM's Defective

1 Vehicles or pay a lesser price. Had Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and the Michigan Subclass
2 members known of true extent of the defective nature of the Defective Vehicles, they would
3 not have purchased (or retained) the vehicles, or would have paid less for them.

4 283. GM intended for Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and Michigan Subclass members to rely
5 on it to provide safe, adequate designed, and adequately manufactured automobiles and to
6 honestly and accurately reveal the problems described throughout this Complaint.

7 284. Further, Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and members of the Michigan Subclass
8 reasonably expected that GM's Defective Vehicles would function safely and not be
9 susceptible to the hazards described within. That is the reasonable and objective consumer
10 expectation for Defective Vehicles.

11 285. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and other Michigan Subclass members have suffered
12 injury in fact and actual damages resulting from GM's material omissions and
13 misrepresentations because they paid an inflated purchase price for the Defective Vehicles.
14 GM failed to inform NHTSA, and therefore failed to inform consumers, that its vehicles had
15 a defective ignition switch that could lead to injury and death. Had Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and
16 the Michigan Subclass members known this, they would either not have purchased their
17 Defective Vehicles at all or would have paid less for them, and would not have retained
18 their Defective Vehicles. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and members of the Michigan Subclass have
19 therefore suffered a "loss" because of the violations of the MCPA complaint of herein.

20 286. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick's and Michigan Subclass members' injuries were
21 proximately caused by GM's deceptive acts or practices. The resulting damage and injury is
22 common to Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and all Michigan Subclass members and can only be
23 adequately remedied through the common, class-wide relief sought herein.

24 287. Plaintiff Kirkpatrick and the Michigan Subclass members are entitled to legal
25 and equitable relief against GM, including injunctions, consequential damages, rescission,
26 restitution, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, prejudgment interest and other relief as appropriate.
27
28

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Express Warranty
(Brought on behalf of the Arizona, New York and Michigan Subclasses)

288. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference every other paragraph of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

289. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Arizona, New York and Michigan Subclasses (collectively referred to as the “Subclasses”) against GM.

290. GM and Old GM are and were at all relevant times "merchants" with respect to motor vehicles.

291. In the course of selling the Defective Vehicles, both GM and Old GM expressly warranted to repair and adjusted to correct defects in materials and workmanship of any part supplied by GM or Old GM. GM has not repaired or adjusted the Defective Vehicles' materials and workmanship defects described herein.

292. GM and Old GM also expressly warranted through statements and advertisements that the Defective Vehicles were of high quality, and at a minimum, would actually work properly and safely.

293. These warranties were made, among other ways, in advertisements and in uniform statements made by both GM and Old GM to the public and consumers of the Defective Vehicles. These affirmations and promises were part of the basis of the bargain between both GM and Old GM, on the one hand, and Plaintiffs and the other Subclass members, on the other hand.

294. Both GM and Old GM breached these warranties by knowingly selling or leasing to Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses the Defective Vehicles with dangerous defects, which carried with it a serious risk of damage, injury and/or death.

295. GM and Old GM failed to deliver to Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses the things purchased, and have delivered a thing other than the thing purchased, and have thus breached the express warranties of sale.

1 296. GM and Old GM intentionally and deceptively withheld material facts
2 regarding the product defects from Plaintiffs, members of the Subclasses.

3 297. Furthermore, the limited warranty of repair and/or adjustments to defective
4 parts fails in its essential purpose because the contractual remedy is insufficient to make
5 Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses whole.

6 298. As such, recovery by Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses is not limited
7 to the limited warrant of repair or adjustment to parts defective in materials or
8 workmanship, and Plaintiffs, individually and on behalf of both the Arizona, New York and
9 Michigan Subclasses, seeks all remedies as allowed by law.

10 299. GM and Old GM knew or should have known that the Defective Vehicles
11 would ultimately be used by Plaintiffs, Subclass members, and members of public.

12 300. To the extent any notice is required, notice of the alleged breach of express
13 warranty due to defects have been provided to GM and Old GM as evidenced by internal
14 documents and the numerous other complaints filed against them, showing a widespread
15 problem, yet GM and Old GM continued in their failure to fix the actual problems and
16 continued in their intentional concealment of material facts.

17 301. As such, Plaintiffs notified GM of the breach within a reasonable time, and/or
18 were not required to do so because affording GM a reasonable opportunity to cure its breach
19 would have been futile. GM was on notice of the defects contained in their Defective
20 Vehicles.

21 302. By way of the foregoing, GM and Old GM breached their express warranties
22 to Plaintiffs and each Subclass.

23 303. The Arizona Subclass: GM's and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and
24 are in violation of Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §47-2313.

25 304. The New York Subclass: GM's and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and
26 are in violation of N.Y. U.C.C. Law §§2-313.

27 305. The Michigan Subclass: GM and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and are
28 in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §440.2313.

306. As a direct and proximate result of GM's and Old GM's breach, Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses have suffered, and will continue to suffer, economic damages, in an amount that will be established at trial according to proof.

307. Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses are entitled to legal and equitable relief against Defendants, including consequential damages, rescission, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other relief as appropriate.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Breach of Implied Warranty (Brought on behalf of the Arizona, New York and Michigan Subclasses)

308. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate by reference every other paragraph of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

309. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of the Arizona, New York and Michigan State Subclasses (collectively referred to as the "Subclasses") against GM, under the implied warranty statutes of the various states outlined below.

310. GM and Old GM were at all relevant times the manufacturer, distributor, warrantor, seller and/or lessor of the Defective Vehicles. GM and Old GM knew or had reason to know of the specific use for which their Defective Vehicles were purchased.

311. At the time Old GM and GM marketed and otherwise placed their Defective Vehicles into the stream of commerce, they knew that the vehicles would be sold to consumers, including Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses, for personal and recreational use. GM and Old GM also knew that consumers, including Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses, would have no ability or opportunity to inspect their vehicles for defects, but instead would rely on skill and judgment to furnish safe and reliable vehicles that were suitable for their particular purpose and free of dangerous defects.

312. To the extent required, upon information and belief, Plaintiffs and all members of the Subclasses, if not in privity with GM or Old GM, are third-party beneficiaries of the contracts entered into between the dealerships and Old GM and/or GM.

1 313. In addition, here, Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses need not prove
2 privity as both Old GM and GM have placed Defective Vehicles into the stream of
3 commerce, which because of the ignition switch defect each Defective Vehicle suffers from
4 is a thing of danger, exposing consumers and members of the public to risk of severe injury
5 or death.

6 314. GM and Old GM were aware of the particular purpose that each Plaintiff and
7 class member had for the Defective Vehicle obtained; however, Old GM and/or GM failed
8 to supply the vehicles to Plaintiff and all members of the Subclasses as described, as the
9 Defective Vehicles present a dangerous safety risk.

10 315. Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses relied on both Old GM and GM's
11 skill and judgment to furnish safe and reliable vehicles that were suitable for their particular
12 purpose and free of dangerous defects.

13 316. As such, Old GM and GM provided Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses
14 with an implied warranty that their Defective Vehicles and any parts thereof were
15 merchantable and fit for the ordinary purposes for which they were sold and not
16 unreasonably dangerous. However, the Defective Vehicles provided to Plaintiffs and the
17 members of the Subclasses are not fit and suitable for their ordinary purpose because, *inter*
18 *alia*, they contained design defects which were likely to cause the Defective Vehicles to
19 inadvertently shut down during ordinary driving conditions, leading to an unreasonable
20 likelihood of accident and an unreasonable likelihood that such accidents would cause
21 serious bodily harm or death to, among others, vehicle occupants.

22 317. Old GM and GM impliedly warranted that the Defective Vehicles were of
23 merchantable quality and fit for such use, did not contain dangerous defects and were not
24 susceptible to inadvertently shutting down during ordinary driving conditions. This implied
25 warranty included, among other things: (1) a warranty that the Defective Vehicles were
26 manufactured, supplied, distributed, and/or sold by Old GM and GM were safe and reliable
27 for their intended purpose; and (2) a warranty that their Defective Vehicles would be fit for
28 their intended use while the Defective Vehicles were being operated.

318. Old GM's and GM's Defective Vehicles supplied to Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses did not possess the basic degree of fitness for ordinary use due to the defects described which created unreasonable risk of danger. The defects are so basic that they render the Defective Vehicles unfit for ordinary purposes. The Defective Vehicles would not pass without objection in the automotive trade. As such, they are not merchantable.

319. Contrary to the applicable implied warranties, Old GM's and GM's Defective Vehicles at the time of sale and thereafter were not fit for their ordinary and intended purpose. Instead, Old GM's and GM's Defective Vehicles are and continue to be defective and dangerous.

320. The Arizona Subclass: GM's and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and are in violation of Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. §47-2314

321. The New York Subclass: GM's and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and are in violation of N.Y. U.C.C. Law §§2-314.

322. The Michigan Subclass: GM's and Old GM's practices, as alleged, were and are in violation of Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. §440.2314.

323. As a direct and proximate result of GM's and Old GM's breach, Plaintiffs and members of the Subclasses have suffered, and will continue to suffer, significant damages, loss and injury in an amount that will be established at trial according to proof.

324. Plaintiffs and the members of the Subclasses are entitled to legal and equitable relief against GM, including consequential damages, rescission, attorneys' fees, costs of suit, and other relief as appropriate.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

Plaintiffs seek a trial by jury for all appropriate issues on each and every cause of action in this Complaint.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against Defendant as follows:

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS AND ALL CLASS MEMBERS:

1) For actual, compensatory and statutory damages/penalties, according to proof;

- 2) For restitution, disgorgement and/or other equitable relief as the Court deems proper;
- 3) For an order that GM be permanently enjoined from performing or proposing to perform any of the aforementioned acts of unfair, unlawful, deceptive and/or fraudulent business practices;
- 4) For an order that GM be permanently enjoined from selling, offering to sell, or otherwise placing into the stream of commerce, dangerously defective vehicles;
- 5) For an order certifying the proposed Class and each Subclasses, designating Plaintiffs as named representative of the Class, and designating the undersigned as Class Counsel;
- 6) For an order that GM provide defect-free vehicles to the Plaintiffs and all members of the each Subclass, and that GM pay all costs associated with the replacement program, including all costs for parts and labor, or alternatively, for an order that GM buy back the defective vehicles of Plaintiffs and all members of the each Subclass;
- 7) For pre-judgment and post-judgment interest according to proof;
- 8) For reasonable attorney's fees and costs of suit;
- 9) For any and all such other and further relief as may be available in law or equity;
- 10) For any and all such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

Respectfully submitted,

ZIMMERMAN REED, PLLP

Dated: April 1, 2014

By: /s/ Hart L. Robinovitch
CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN, ESQ
HART L. ROBINOVITCH, ESQ
BRADLEY C. BUHROW, ESQ.
14646 N. Kierland Blvd., Suite 145
Scottsdale, AZ 85254

Attorneys for Plaintiffs